

Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 145663

72

ORIGIN MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ADP-00 IO-13 OIC-04 AEC-11 ACDA-19

OMB-01 TRSE-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SAJ-01 DODE-00 H-03

NSC-10 SS-15 NSCE-00 SSO-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 /141 R

DRAFTED BY D/MBFR:JDEAN:AS

7/24/73 EXT. 27772

APPROVED BY D/MBFR:JDEAN

PM/DCA:VBAKER

ACDA:DLINEBAUGH

EUR/RPM:ESTREATOR

EUR:GSPRINGSTEEN

NSC:MPOWER

OSD/ISA:RBARTHOLOMEW

JCS:COL. CLARK

S/S - MR. GAMMON

----- 044896

O R 250016Z JUL 73

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO USMISSION NATO IMMEDIATE

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 145663

E.O. 11652 GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: NAC CONSIDERATION OF BELGIAN DRAFT OF
ALLIED COORDINATION AND UK STEERING BRIEF

REF: A. USNATO 3396; B. USNATO 3421; C. USNATO 3451;
D. STATE 134964; E. STATE 143947;
F. USNATO 3497

1. IT IS NOT CLEAR TO US FROM USNATO 3421 THAT NAC WILL
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 145663

WISH TO DISCUSS BELGIAN AND UK PAPERS PRIOR TO RECEIVING
US RECOMMENDATIONS ON MBFR SUBSTANCE WHICH WE WOULD HOPE
WOULD BE AVAILABLE FOR NAC MEETING ON JULY 27. WE THINK
IT WOULD BE PRACTICAL TO POSTPONE DISCUSSION ON PROCEDURES

UNTIL AFTER SUBMISSION OF US RECOMMENDATIONS ON SUBSTANCE
AND MISSION SHOULD ATTEMPT TO GAIN AGREEMENT TO THIS COURSE.
IF THIS IS NOT FEASIBLE AND THERE IS CONSIDERABLE SENTIMENT
FOR AT LEAST INITIAL NAC DISCUSSION OF BOTH PAPERS, MISSION
SHOULD SEEK TO KEEP DISCUSSION GENERAL AND POSTPONE DE-
TAILED DISCUSSION UNTIL AFTER SUBMISSION AND DISCUSSION
OF US POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS.

2. AS APPROPRIATE, MISSION MAY MAKE FOLLOWING GENERAL
POINTS ON PROCEDURES:

A. THE OVERRIDING ALLIED OBJECTIVE IS TO ACHIEVE A
ADP793
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 TOKYO 09515 251248Z

45
ACTION EA-14

INFO OCT-01 AF-10 NEA-10 IO-13 ADP-00 PM-07 NSC-10 SS-15

RSC-01 CIAE-00 DODE-00 INR-10 NSAE-00 PA-03 USIA-15

PRS-01 NIC-01 EB-11 SCEM-02 INT-08 COME-00 AID-20

OMB-01 TRSE-00 XMB-07 ACDA-19 RSR-01 /180 W

----- 049519

R 250545Z JUL 73 ZDK
FM AMEMBASSY TOKYO
TO SEVSTATE WASHDC 5609
INFO AMEMBASSY AMMAN
AMEMBASSY ANKARA
AMEMBASSY BEIRUT
USINT CAIRO
AMEMBASSY JIDDA
AMEMBASSY KUWAIT
AMEMBASSY RABAT
AMEMBASSY TEL AVIV
AMEMBASSH TEHRAN
AMEMBASSY TUNIS
USMISSION USUN NEW YORK

C O N F I D E N T I A L TOKYO 9515

E.O. 16652 - GDS
TAGS: PFOR, JA, XF
SUBJECT: CONFERENCE OF JAPANESE AMBASSADORS TO MIDDLE
EAST AND NORTH AFRICA

SUMMARY: AT ANNUAL CONFERENCE, JAPANESE AMBASSADORS TO
MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA EXPRESSEE GUARDED OPTIMISM
ABOUT PROSPECTS FOR STABILITY IN MIDDLE EAST. THEY SAW
NO NEED TO CHANGE GOJ POLICIES IN ORDER TO ENSURE CON-

TINUING SUPPLY OF PETROLEUM, BUT ALSO AGREED THAT GOJ
EXERCISES LITTLE INFLUENCE IN AREA. THEY SAW NO SOLU-
TIONS TO IMPASSE IN ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT OTHER THAN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 TOKYO 09515 251248Z

RENEWED APPEALS TO GREAT POWERS. THEY AGREED THAT GOJ
SHOULD INCREASE ASSISTANCE TO NON-OIL PRODUCTING STATES
IN AREA. END OF SUMMARY.

1. JAPANESE AMBASSADORS TO AFGHANISTAN, IRAN, KUWAIT,
IRAQ, SAUDI AGABIA, SYRIA, LEBANON, ISRAEL, EGYPT, SUDAN,
TUNISIA, ALGERIA AND MOROCCO (CHARGE IN LIBYA REMAINED IN
PLACE) HELD ANNUAL CONFERENCE IN TOKYO JULY 9-11. FONOFF
VICEMIN HOGEN MADE POINTS CITED IN SUMMARY ABOVE TO
AMBASSADOR AS MAJOR CONCLUSIONS OF CONFERENCE. EMBOFFS
FOLLOWED UP WITH MIDDLE EAST DIVISION HEAD YAMAMOTO
WHO PROVIDED FOLLOWING SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.

2. ARAB-ISRAELI DISPUTE - A
CONSENSUS ON A SUBSTANTIVE APPROACH TO MBFR. THIS SHOULD
TAKE PRECEDENCE IN THE DAYS IMMEDIATELY AHEAD OVER PRO-
CEDURAL ISSUES.

B. US BELIEVES ANY AGREEMENT ON PROCEDURES SHOULD BE
OF A PRAGMATIC CHARACTER DESIGNED TO ACHIEVE THE COMMON
ALLIED NEGOTIATING GOAL.

C. WE REALIZE THAT LEGITIMATE NATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS
ARE INVOLVED IN THE DESIRE TO CLARIFY PROCEDURES. WE
ALSO REALIZE THAT WORKABLE PROCEDURES CAN BE A USEFUL
CONTRIBUTION TO NATO SOLIDARITY WHICH ALL SUPPORT.

D. BY AND LARGE WE CONSIDER THAT THE PROCEDURES USED
DURING THE MBFR EXPLORATORY TALKS WERE WORKABLE AND MET
THE STANDARDS WE HAVE MENTIONED.

E. IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO IMPROVE THESE PROCEDURES.
HOWEVER, THE OBJECTIVE SHOULD BE A PROCEDURE THAT PROVIDES
FLEXIBILITY AND EFFICIENCY IN NEGOTIATION WHILE TAKING
INTO ACCOUNT CONSIDERATIONS OF BOTH NATIONAL INTERESTS
AND THOSE OF ALLIANCE SOLIDARITY.

F. WE WOULD THEREFORE ARGUE FOR METHODS WHICH ARE AT-
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 145663

TUNED TO THE SPECIFIC NEGOTIATING GOAL TO BE AGREED BY
THE ALLIANCE AND WHICH PERMIT THE ALLIED NEGOTIATING TEAM
A HIGH DEGREE OF FLEXIBILITY.

G. THE BELGIAN PAPER CONTAINS SOME USEFUL POINTS ON HANDLING OF DISAGREEMENTS WITHIN THE AD HOC GROUP WHICH WE BELIEVE MIGHT BE PURSUED FURTHER.

H. AS REGARDS PROPOSALS ON CHAIRMANSHIP OF AD HOC GROUP, WE BELIEVE THAT THE AD HOC GROUP SHOULD BE GIVEN OPPORTUNITY TO ESTABLISH PROCEDURES FOR ITS OWN INTERNAL MEETINGS AND ALSO THAT THE ROTATION PRINCIPLE USED IN VIENNA WAS A GOOD ONE IN GIVING ALL INTERESTED ALLIES AN OPPORTUNITY TO UNDERTAKE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF CHAIRMANSHIP.

I. IN ANY CASE WE CONSIDER THAT FURTHER DETAILED COMMENTS ON THE BELGIAN PAPER SHOULD BE POSTPONED UNTIL A LATER TIME AFTER WE HAVE HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO DECIDE TOGETHER ON OUR POLICY APPROACH TO THE MBFR NEGOTIATIONS.

3. CONCERNING PROCEDURAL ASPECTS OF THE UK PAPER, IT APPEARS TO US IN GENERAL USEFULLY PRAGMATIC AND FLEXIBLE.

4. AS REGARDS THE STEERING BRIEF ASPECTS OF THE UK

PAPER, WE TOO CONSIDER THAT THE ALLIANCE SHOULD HAVE AN AGREED APPROACH TO COVER THE FIRST PHASE OF THE NEGOTIATIONS, AND WE WILL HAVE PROPOSALS OF OUR OWN TO MAKE ON THIS SHORTLY. WE BELIEVE THAT SUCH PROPOSALS SHOULD BE TAILORED TO FIT OUR OVERALL NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES ONCE THE ALLIANCE HAS AGREED UPON THEM. HOWEVER, WE WOULD PREFER TO AVOID A STERILE AGENDA DEBATE WITH THE EAST, A DIRECTION IN WHICH SOME PROVISIONS OF THE UK PAPER COULD LEAD US. THE VIENNA TALKS PROVIDED MEANS FOR AVOIDING THIS OUTCOME WHICH SHOULD BE USED. BUT AS IN THE CASE OF THE BELGIAN PAPER, ONCE THE DECISIONS OF THE COUNCIL AS REGARDS THE AGREED ALLIANCE SUBSTANTIVE APPROACH TO MBFR NEGOTIATIONS HAVE BEEN REACHED, WE WILL BE IN A BETTER POSITION TO ADDRESS THE UK PAPER IN DETAIL.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 145663

5. WE BELIEVE ABOVE POINTS COVER MOST SUGGESTED COMMENTS PROPOSED IN PARA 6 AND 7 OF REFTEL E AND SUGGEST THAT MISSION STAY WITHIN THIS MORE GENERAL APPROACH. WE WOULD PREFER THAT POINT 7A NOT BE USED SINCE IT MOVES IN DIRECTION OF SPECIFICS WE WISH TO AVOID. ROGERS

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 10 MAY 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 25 JUL 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: boyleja
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973STATE145663
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: D/MBFR:JDEAN:AS
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730768/abqcemxk.tel
Line Count: 211
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ORIGIN MBFR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. USNATO 3396; B. USNATO 3421; C. USNATO 3451; D. STATE 134964; E. STATE 143947; F. USNATO 3497
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: boyleja
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 14 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <14-Aug-2001 by izenbei0>; APPROVED <20-Sep-2001 by boyleja>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status:
Subject: MBFR: NAC CONSIDERATION OF BELGIAN DRAFT OF ALLIED COORDINATION AND UK STEERING BRIEF
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: NATO INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005